

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims presently on file are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH**

Claims 20 - 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph on the ground that they fail to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since the recited "hierarchical database structure" and "relational database structure" define general concepts that well known in the field. Nonetheless, Applicants have canceled claims 20-22, without prejudice, and reserve the right to file continuing application(s) to capture the subject matter of the canceled claims.

#### **CLAIMS REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

Claims 1 - 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph on the ground that claims 1, 8, and 15 do not clarify what is meant with dissimilar databases or dissimilar structures.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to further explain an example of what is meant by dissimilar databases. In essence, in the present example, dissimilar databases have dissimilar structures and dissimilar programming languages. Reference is made to page 2, lines 4 - 5 of the specification. No new matter has been introduced by the current

amendment. As a result, claims 1 - 22 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph.

### **ALLOWABLE CLAIMS**

Claims 1 - 19 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph. Based on the presentation above, Applicants submit that all the claims on file are now allowable.

### **TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

Applicants thank the Examiner for according the undersigned, Mr. S. Kassatly, a telephone interview on April 24, 2006, according to which the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, First and Second Paragraphs raised in the office action of March 7, 2006, were raised. It was agreed that claims 20-22 will be canceled without prejudice, and that the independent claims 1, 8, and 15 will be amended to clarify what is meant by dissimilar databases and supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully submit the current amendment in accordance with the agreement in the telephone interview, and that the claims on file are allowable.

### **CONCLUSION**

All the claims presently on file in the present application are in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If it is felt for any reason that direct communication would serve to advance

Application Serial No.: 10/091,761  
Filing Date: March 6, 2002

Reply to Office action of: March 7, 2006  
Attorney Docket No.: YOR920010756US1

prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Date: April 24, 2006

Samuel A. Kassatly Law Office  
20690 View Oaks Way  
San Jose, CA 95120  
Tel: (408) 323-5111  
Fax: (408) 521-0111

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Kassatly', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

---

Samuel A. Kassatly  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 32,247